

---

**Worksheet**  
**Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management

---

**OFFICE:** Lake Havasu Field Office (LHFO), AZ-C030

**TRACKING NUMBER:** DOI-BLM-AZ-C030-2014-0021-DNA

**CASE FILE NUMBER:**

**PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE:** Partners Point Site Improvements,  
Construction of Seawall

**LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION:**

Travel 0.26 miles west on Sweetwater Avenue to the BLM Lake Havasu Field Office, which is located at 2610 Sweetwater Avenue, Lake Havasu City, AZ. 86406; thence 1.16 miles south on an unnamed road to the Partners Point work yard.

Latitude 34.441935° Longitude -114.315564 °

**APPLICANT (if any):**

**A Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:**

This project will replace the existing boat loading facility with a safe and functional boat loading and unloading facility that also supports the volume of boats and frequency of use required for effective lake-site maintenance and patrol.

The Concept Drawings and Outline Specifications represent a solution which requires furnishing transportation, labor, equipment and materials to design and construct a concrete retaining wall and seawall comprised of interlocking steel sheet-piles along the shoreline of Lake Havasu. This work includes site survey for contours, design planning and development, preparation of specifications and drawings, construction layout, sheet pile installation backfilling and compaction, tie-back anchor installation, concrete slab and decking, temporary and permanent security fencing and gates, concrete retaining wall, pipe railing, concrete caps, erosion control and surface drainage.

The project area is approximately 0.2 acres, not including a potential additional stockpile/staging area that is located northerly from the project site, approximately 300 feet away, alongside the project site access road.

**B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance**

LUP name: Yuma District Resource Management Plan, August 1995  
Lake Havasu Field Office Resource Management Plan May 2007

As with the original proposed action outlined in the 'Bluebird' EA-AZ-070-97-034 this proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

....'where warranted by increased recreation needs and demands the recreation program will be expanded to additional lands covered by the plan.

The facility known as Partners Point will be retained and maintained by the BLM and cooperating parties to facilitate aquatic habitat management and other BLM management requirements.

This proposed action is also supported by, and in conformance with, goals established in the Fisheries Improvement Program, which is a product of the Land use Plan. Fisheries improvement goals deal specifically with fish habitat enhancement, native fish restoration, and shoreline access improvements. The proposed action would facilitate accomplishments towards each of those goals.

**C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.**

Although the original document for 'Bluebird' Administrative site (EA-AZ-070-97-034) is old and did not cover environmental justice for that site, there has been no change in the original justification for action and purpose, and no one affected by the proposed action.

USCOE Section 402 approval letter; Nationwide Permit #13.

**D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria**

**1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?**

YES: It is similar to the original in scope as original development plans included provisions for this action. This proposed action allows improved authorized access management for the public while restricting unauthorized access into closed areas, protecting natural and cultural resource damage from unauthorized vehicle access.

**Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?**

YES: The original project boundary and analysis area as described in the 'Bluebird' EA-AZ-07-97-034 are the same for this proposed project. The original document covered disturbance area boundaries that encompass the same boundaries and analysis areas as this proposed project, therefore there are no geographic, resource condition or location differences.

**If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?**

N/A

**2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?**

YES: Under the original EA a range of alternatives covered construction of a new access road, public parking, environmental, water quality and other potential work site issues were addressed. There is no new information regarding environmental concerns, interests or resource values that would change the analysis decision.

**3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)?**

YES: If we are providing a worksite for staff to perform certain functions related to program goals and missions, then we must provide an adequate boat dock and loading area with minimal environmental effects. The current proposal increases the safety and efficiency of operations and labor over the current condition.

**Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?**

YES: No new information or circumstances regarding this new proposed action would change the analysis of the original proposed action, but only enhance the goals and mission of the programs involved, work effort and comply with current health, safety and environmental regulations.

**4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?**

YES: The direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of the new proposed action are essentially unchanged from the referenced EA-AZ-070-97-034 since it addressed air quality, cultural, hazardous or solid waste, water quality/protection, wildlife, vegetation, visual resources, recreation, range, and paleontology and no additional disturbance or affects outside original boundaries will take place.

**5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?**

There was no interagency or public review of the NEPA documents since the location was an established BLM worksite site and was not controversial as an existing location sitting on BLM administered lands and no individuals or groups were involved.

## E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Jennifer House,	Wildlife Biologist	BLM/LHFO
Dr. George Shannon Jr.	Archaeologist	BLM/LHFO

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

## Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

<hr/> Doug Adams Project Lead	<hr/> Date
<hr/> David B. Daniels Planning and Environmental Coordinator	<hr/> Date
<hr/> Amanda Dodson Supervisor Lands & Resources	<hr/> Date
<hr/> Signature of the Responsible Official Kimber Liebhauser Field Manager Lake Havasu Field Office	<hr/> Date

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest and appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.

## **DECISION RECORD**

**Tracking Number: DOI-BLM-AZ-C030-2014-0021-DNA**

### **Description of the Proposed Action:**

This project will replace the existing boat loading facility with a safe and functional boat loading and unloading facility that also supports the volume of boats and frequency of use required for effective lake-site maintenance and patrol.

The Concept Drawings and Outline Specifications represent a solution which requires furnishing transportation, labor, equipment and materials to design and construct a concrete retaining wall and seawall comprised of interlocking steel sheet-piles along the shoreline of Lake Havasu. This work includes site survey for contours, design planning and development, preparation of specifications and drawings, construction layout, sheet pile installation backfilling and compaction, tie-back anchor installation, concrete slab and decking, temporary and permanent security fencing and gates, concrete retaining wall, pipe railing, concrete caps, erosion control and surface drainage.

The project area is approximately 0.2 acres, not including a potential additional stockpile/staging area that is located northerly from the project site, approximately 300 feet away, alongside the project site access road.

**LUP Name: Yuma District Resource Management Plan, August 1995  
Lake Havasu Field Office Resource Management Plan May 2007**

Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts contained in the attached Determination of NEPA Adequacy and as analyzed in the previous environmental assessment ('Bluebird' EA-AZ-070-97-034), I have determined that the action will not have a significant effect on the human environment. An environmental impact statement is therefore not required.

It is my decision to approve the action as proposed, with the following stipulations (if applicable).

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of the Responsible Official  
Kimber Liebhauser  
Field Manager  
Lake Havasu Field Office

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

### **Exhibits:**

1 ) Stipulations:

1. Permittee shall comply with all State and Federal laws relating to prehistoric or historic archaeological sites or artifacts. Actions other than those explicitly approved by the Bureau of Land Management which result in impacts upon archaeological resources, shall be subject to the judicial proceedings of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, as amended, and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. As property of the United States, no person may, without authorization, excavate, remove, damage, or otherwise alter or deface any historic or prehistoric site, artifact, or object of antiquity located on public lands.

2. Surface collection of artifacts (either historic or prehistoric) or fossils, by permittee or tour participants on or near any designated route is prohibited. The definition of an artifact is anything that has been made, used or modified by a human. Permittee is required to inform all participants that collecting artifacts, theft or vandalism of any cultural property is a violation of the above mentioned Federal and/or State laws.

3. Care shall be taken not to disturb or destroy desert tortoises or their burrows. Handling, collecting, damaging, or destroying desert tortoises are prohibited by Arizona State Statute. Any sightings of desert tortoise shall be immediately reported to the LHFO, Wildlife Biologist at (928) 505-1200. If a desert tortoise is endangered by any activity that activity shall cease until the desert tortoise moves out of harm's way on its own accord or is moved following the attached guidelines "Guidelines for Handling Sonoran Desert Tortoises Encountered on Development Projects."

4. If any species listed as threatened or endangered under Federal or State of Arizona regulations are encountered during the activities, work would immediately stop. Immediate telephone notification of the discovery would be made to the BLM Wildlife Biologist at (928) 505-1200. The activity may resume only after the Authorized Officer has given approval.

5. The Contractor, its successors or assigns, shall comply with all Federal and State laws applicable to the disposal, placement, or release of hazardous substances (substance as defined in 40 CFR Part 302).